

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 28-31 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, and 28 are amended, and claims 29-31 are added. No new matter is added.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4, and 28 is found, at least in paragraphs [0029] and [0035] of the Specification and FIGS. 1, 4, and 5.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 2, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 6 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,644,782), in view of Kullick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,997). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest, a database updating apparatus, wherein the user computer comprises an optical disc recording/reproducing apparatus, and is configured to record data on and reproduce data from an optical disc, in which a database, an encryption key, and a date and time of a last update of the database are recorded, wherein the date and time of the last update are generated by the server, and record an encrypted password which is encrypted using the encryption key on the optical disc, as defined in claim 1.

It is also respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest a method of updating a database comprising permitting a user computer usable with an optical disc, on which a vendor database and an encryption key are recorded in a read only region of the optical disc, to access a server of the database vendor, via a network; and recording an encrypted password which is encrypted using the encryption key on the optical disc, as defined in claim 4.

It is also respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest a method of distributing and maintaining a database, the method comprising distributing an optical disc having a read-only region in which a data base corresponding to a first date and time and an encryption key are recorded and a recordable region in which the first date and time is recorded, and storing the update data and an encrypted password that is encrypted using the encryption key in the recordable region of the optical disc, as defined in claim 28.

Instead, Yeates simply discloses a data storage system 270 that includes a read only memory device 274 and a read-write auxiliary memory device 276 (see, for example, col. 2, lines 48-50 and FIG. 2 of Yeates). The read only memory device 274 is disclosed as having map-display data, engineering drawings, patents, an information database, a dictionary, and other similar relatively static-type information, while the read-write memory device 276 is disclosed as being used to store supplementary data reflecting updates to the primary data (see, col. 2, lines 56-64 of Yeates). However, Yeates fails to disclose or suggest an encryption key, or an encrypted password that is encrypted using the encryption key.

Also, Kullick simply discloses a full index 36 that contains index entries 50 of various information (see, for example, col. 5, lines 55-60, and FIGS. 3a and 3b of Kullick). However, Kullick fails to disclose or suggest an encryption key, or an encrypted password that is encrypted using the encryption key.

Second, it is respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest the modified/updated data for the initial data of the database transmitted from the server is recorded in a recordable region of the optical disc, as recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest recording the modified/updated data in the recordable region of the optical disc, as recited in claim 4.

It is respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose or suggest, storing the update data and an encrypted password which is encrypted using the encryption key in the recordable region of the optical disc, as recited in claim 28.

Specifically, none of the references disclose or suggest recording or storing the modified, update, or updated data in the optical disc. Rather, Yeates simply discloses updates recorded in a read-write computer hard disk (see, col. 3, lines 17-22 of Yeates). Also, Kullick simply discloses an optical disk unit 19b but does not disclose that the optical disk unit 19b contains the recited modified, update, or updated data. Thus, none of the references disclose or even suggest recording or storing the modified, update, or updated data in the optical disc.

Thus, Yeates, Kullick, or their combination fails to disclose each and every feature of claims 1, 4, and 28. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claim 6, which depends from claim 4, is likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 7, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeates, in view of Kullick, in further view of Alloul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,130). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination disclose each and every feature of claims 1 and 4, from which claims 3 and 7 respectively depend. Alloul, which is applied for the alleged teaching of electronic transaction involving purchase orders, simply discusses using an encrypted format for security purposes (see col. 6, lines 28-29 of Alloul), but fails to disclose or suggest an encryption key, or an encrypted password that is encrypted using the encryption key. Accordingly, claims 3 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 1/14/2008

By: Seth S. Kim
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510